

# **IMAC QA Subcommittee**

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **September 27, 2004**

Members Present: John Haine, DHFS; Jackie Bennett, Racine County; Lisa Hanson, DHFS; Pam Lohaus, DHFS; Vicki Jessup, DHFS; Marilyn Rudd, DHFS; Chris Elms, Dane County; Marcia Williamson, DHFS; Kathy Judd, Dane County; Bernadette Connolly, DHFS

Via Conference Call: Loire Mueller, La Crosse County and Joanne Ator, Door County

Members Absent: Jackie Coutant, Milwaukee County

#### **Administrative Items**

The July 26, 2004 minutes were approved as written.

#### **Status of Food Stamp 2<sup>nd</sup> Party Review porcess in Milwaukee County**

Phase 1 of the Milwaukee County “Find and Fix” Project has officially ended and Phase 2, the implementation of a new 2<sup>nd</sup> party review process, has begun. Last week was devoted to training all Milwaukee County Supervisors and Section Chiefs on the new second party case review process.

A review list will be available each month on the IMQA system, IMQA was formerly known as FSQA or NEWMAN. This list will contain a maximum of eight new applications or reviews and will be drawn per FS worker. The cases will contain only households of two or more and benefits greater than \$100.

Supervisors are required to pull a minimum of two cases per worker, or the equivalent, for review and to use the too developed specifically for the “Find and Fix”. The review tool focuses on the top five error elements and is meant to improve payment accuracy while addressing agency workload issues.

The State’s Payment Accuracy Consultants (PAC) will continue to focus on Milwaukee County. In this Phase 2, they will randomly select and review completed cases, those cases that supervisors have reviewed.. The PAC Team is only available for third party reviews and to mentor supervisors in this process.

PAC will enter their findings to assure completion of these reviews and the accuracy of the supervisor. They will enter this information into IMQA to provide the county with data supporting training requests, system changes, etc.

The Quality Assurance reviewers will also compare their monthly sample with the IMQA list to determine if any of their QA cases were on the IMQA review list. The finding of the QA staff person will also be entered into IMQA providing additional data with which to measure the success of this “Find and Fix” Phase.

A planning team made up of State and County staff developed the process described above to assure continued payment accuracy and reduced error rates.

The May 2004 error rate for Milwaukee County was 2.8% so there is a strong indication that with continued emphasis, this goal will be met.

### **Status of Food Stamp 2<sup>nd</sup> Party Review and an Operations Memo**

A second party review list will now be created for the balance of the state. It will be drawn on the first Tuesday of the first full week each month. The list will then be available the following day, so beginning with the October 5<sup>th</sup> draw agencies will find their report on IMQA on Wednesday October 6<sup>th</sup>. (An Operations Memo is being developed to provide local agencies with information regarding locating their list and implementing this review process.)

The list will be sorted by worker; the worker who completed the most recent application or review will be shown first. It will also provide the case number, client name (s), AG size, status (application or review), benefit month, and permanent worker assigned to that case. There will be a maximum of eight new applications and reviews for each FS worker.

After a lengthy discussion it was concluded that the Operations Memo should introduce the new report. Clear instructions will be provided for accessing it and agencies will be encouraged to fold into their current internal second party review process. The state will solicit local agency feedback after four months of availability. This will assist the state in determining how this list should be implemented, mandated use or implemented by choice. (The balance of State’s decision will not impact Milwaukee County’s process.)

The review tool, piloted during the “Fix and Find” project, will be made available as a template in this Operations Memo. This is a shorter review instrument as it focuses on five error prone areas and is not a full review. The attending sub-committee members agreed that the use of this tool would be discretionary. The only requirement will be that the top five error elements always are reviewed and their findings always entered into IMQA. Agencies will continue to be encouraged to complete full reviews and if they do so, to enter all of their findings, above and beyond the top five, into IMQA.

### **Status of contract changes for 2005 passthrough**

The 2005 contract language submitted by our sub-committee, relative to Agency Preventable Error (APE) penalties, was returned for language clarification. A mini-sub-

committee was formed, Bernadette Connally, John Haine, Vicki Jessup, Marilyn Rudd and Marcia Williamson met to review our original language, developed the text below. The full committees re-reviewed the following suggested language change:

**Some local agencies may be subject to Food Stamp penalty pass-through. A Food Stamp payment accuracy sanction pass-through is based on the following criteria:**

- 1. Wisconsin must be in sanction status.**
- 2. Then sanction pass-through is assessed to only those agencies with a sample of 30 or more cases and had an error rate above either the federal tolerance level or 6%, whichever is higher.**
- 3. There is a sanction cap of 1% of the agency's IM allocation. The base IMAA is defined to include any one-time supplemental funding provided to the County for IM administration for the calendar year. The base IMAA does not include: the separate allocations for fraud; program integrity; MA transportation; W-2 funeral and cemetery, or non W-2 funeral and cemetery; funding provided under the family care addendum; estate recovery incentive payments; or county IM contributions (overmatch).**

**The following process is used to calculate a sanction pass-through:**

- 1. The total state's agency preventable error dollar amount is calculated as a percentage of the total dollars in error. This percentage is applied to the sanction to derive a total possible sanction pass-through.**
- 2. The local agency preventable error is calculated as a percentage of the state's agency preventable error dollar amount. This percentage is applied to the agency preventable error portion of the sanction.**

**For example, if the state's total dollars in error is \$10,000 and the agency preventable error portion is \$5,000 then 50% of any sanction would be associated with agency preventable error. If the state received a sanction of \$400,000 then 50% (\$200,000) would be associated with agency preventable error and subject to a pass-through.**

**If a local agency accounted for 20% of the state's total agency preventable error then that agency would be sanctioned for 20% of \$200,000 or \$40,000.**

The full QA Sub-committee approved this language and it will be re-submitted to the Contract Unit.

**The next meeting will be held on October 25, 2004.  
Minutes will be taken by -----**